

INFORMATION BULLETIN

JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

Number: B97-72

Date: December 23, 1997

Expiration Date: 6/30/98

69:127:is

TO: SERVICE DELIVERY AREA ADMINISTRATORS
PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL CHAIRPERSONS
EDD JOB SERVICE MANAGERS
EDD WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH STAFF

SUBJECT: SERVICE DELIVERY AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

The summary of the November 7, 1997, Service Delivery Area (SDA) Advisory Committee meeting is attached. If you have any questions regarding the summary, please contact:

Brett Lapp (916) 653-3560 (phone)
(916) 654-8039 (fax)
blapp@edd.ca.gov (e-mail address)

/S/ BILL BURKE
Acting Assistant Deputy Director

Attachment

**SERVICE DELIVERY AREA
ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING NOTES
NOVEMBER 7, 1997
750 N STREET, CONFERENCE ROOM A
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA**

Kathy Sage provided opening comments regarding the Department of Labor's (DOL) response to the State of California's Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) waiver requests. Kathy indicated that the Employment Development Department (EDD) was continuing its discussions with the DOL regarding the State's concerns with the waivers offer. Some of the State's concerns raised to DOL at that time included:

- The waivers offer was not what the State and the DOL negotiated and the State felt that the DOL did not bargain entirely in good faith;
- The four percent across-the-board increase in performance measurement outcomes was unreasonable, especially since less than half the program year would remain by the time the waivers are approved; and
- Although some of the waiver provisions can be applied retroactively, they won't necessarily affect program measurement outcomes.

It was mentioned that there is a perception by some in Washington D.C. that California was trying to use the waiver process to avoid accountability for program outcomes. In addition, it was perceived that California needs to strengthen its strategy on how it collects data and holds the local level accountable. The State will work with the SDAs to develop a response to DOL's waivers offer.

State's Response to DOL Waivers Offer

Kathy prefaced this discussion by expressing the need to keep in mind how the public will perceive the State's response and the need to devise a response that is a reasonable approach to expected outcomes, given California's unique diversity and complexity.

The two possible responses to the DOL were outlined as: reiterate the State's waiver needs by basically resubmitting the original waiver request; or prepare an offer of compromise with reasonable performance measurement outcomes that the SDA community can agree to.

There was a consensus that the waivers are needed for the SDA's to successfully serve Welfare-to-Work clients and therefore, an offer of compromise was the best course of action. The suggested approaches discussed were:

- California could ask for only the waivers that are still viable given the time remaining in this program year, and could agree to all the waivers next program year with a compromise on the expected four percent across-the-board program improvements;

- Accept all waivers and negotiate for the four percent performance increase to be taken over an 18 month period (the rest of this program year, plus next program year);
- Use the performance incentive award funds as part of a performance outcome improvement system for rewarding SDAs that accept some optional waivers and who meet established percentages of program outcomes improvement.

In any of these options it was agreed that an overriding concern is that since half the program year is gone, the State wants reasonable expectations for this year's program outcomes and reasonable negotiated expectations for Program Year 1998-99 outcomes.

Concern was expressed by some of the SDAs that using the prior program years performance outcomes to base the next years program outcomes expectations is unreasonable because the Welfare-to-Work clientele will drive outcomes down.

Concern was also expressed that the expected program outcomes percentage increase for current high performers would be an unfair way to measure improvement.

Kathy suggested that a work group be formed to look at the waivers and what they would mean to the SDAs in a full program year. The work group could also develop some compromise language that could be included in the State's response to the DOL. A consensus was reached to call back the SDA representatives from the waivers planning work group to help in this effort.

Welfare-to-Work

Kathy informed the attendees that various SDA allocation formulas for Welfare-to-Work grant funds were sent to the Governor's Office for review. If the Department does not receive a response on the allocation formulas by the end of next week, the EDD will ask the Governor's Office for permission to release information to the SDA community containing a range of possible funding allocations.

If the State submits its Welfare-to-Work grant State Plan by December 12, 1997, the DOL has promised that funds will be made available by January 1, 1998. To be eligible for the early allocation, the State should look at how the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) plan was put together and try to draft the Welfare-to-Work plan in a similar high level fashion. A draft of the State plan will be sent out to every public venue for review and comment.

Planning instructions will be available possibly in early December but only after the Governor's Office makes decisions on issues such as match.

Concern was raised regarding the lack of profiling information from the Department of Social Services on Welfare-to-Work clientele. The lack of information will make it difficult for SDAs to plan for workload, contract with service providers, ensure that enough classroom space and instructors are available, etc.

Questions concerning match arose. Some of the questions included:

- What happens if the United Way serves program eligible people with funds that can be used as match on activities that are not necessarily allowable under terms and conditions of the grant?
- Has the funds used by agencies such as the Goodwill industries already been accounted for as match by some other program?
- Can money collected for child support that gets a family off the TANF rolls be considered in the match calculation?
- Is money in the Parent Fair Share systems, etc. worth looking at for possible match dollars?

Kathy reported that when she asked Christine Chudd how funds used on Welfare-to-Work clients and services by agencies such as the United Way and Goodwill Industries would be considered, in-kind or cash for match purposes, Christine answered that those funds would be considered cash for match calculation purposes.

AB 67 Requirements

Rob Arthur from the EDD Job Services Division (JSD) provided information on the requirements of AB 67. The language in the bill requires that the JSD assist in the development of local plans on how partnerships in each community will coordinate employer outreach, solicitation of entry level job listings, etc.

Concern was expressed that some SDAs already have establish roles and responsibilities regarding these activities in their annual planning. A briefing will be provided on AB 67 requirements at the December 5, 1997, SDA Administrators Meeting.

Agenda Building for SDA Quarterly

Items suggested for agenda building for the next SDA Quarterly meeting included: Waivers Briefing; Premises/Facilities Update; Welfare-to-Work presentation encompassing CalWORKS etc.; One-stop Update; Court Decision regarding Fund Recapture (SELACO); SB 645 Update; New Budget Language regarding 8 percent funds and 30 percent CDE funds; Timing of when the various Welfare Reform plans are due; Job Creation; State and Federal Legislative Updates.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 PM.